



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

5a

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/086,792	02/28/2002	Donald James McNamara	13768.242	8972

47973 7590 05/09/2005

WORKMAN NYDEGGER/MICROSOFT
1000 EAGLE GATE TOWER
60 EAST SOUTH TEMPLE
SALT LAKE CITY, UT 84111

EXAMINER

MEUCCI, MICHAEL D

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2142

DATE MAILED: 05/09/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/086,792	Applicant(s) MCNAMARA ET AL.	
	Examiner Michael D. Meucci	Art Unit 2142	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 February 2002.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-46 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-46 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 28 February 2002 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>2/28/02</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Objections

1. Claim 24 objected to because of the following informalities: "have" on line 5 of page 41 should be replaced with --having--. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

3. Claims 1-23, 35-41, and 44-46 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. It is unclear to the examiner what is meant to be disclosed by "an act of" in all rejected claims. Examiner suggests using typical claim language such as --a step of--. Correction is required.
4. Claim 11 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. It is unclear to the examiner what is meant to be disclosed by "an express category" in lines 3 and 5 of the claim since this term is not defined by the specification. For the purpose of applying art, it will be presumed that any category can be detected/not detected. Correction is required.
5. Claim 17 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. It is unclear to the examiner what is meant to be disclosed by

"an act of authenticating" in line 4 of the claim. For the purpose of applying art, it will be presumed that any authentication can be used in any manner. Correction is required.

6. Claim 20 recites the limitation "the user" in line 4 of the claim. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

7. Claim 44-46 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. It is unclear to the examiner what is meant to be disclosed by "a scalable fashion" in lines 6 and 7 of claim 44, line 2 of claim 45, and line 2 of claim 46 since this term is not defined by the specification. For the purpose of applying art, it will be presumed that "in a scalable fashion" means --in some fashion--. Correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

8. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

9. Claims 24-34 and 42-43 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. The claims are not limited to tangible embodiments. In view of Applicant's disclosure, specification page 10, lines 11-14, the medium is not limited to tangible embodiments, instead being defined as including both tangible embodiments (e.g. physical storage media such as RAM, ROM, EEPROM, CD-ROM or other optical disk storage, magnetic disk storage or other magnetic storage devices) and intangible embodiments (e.g. any other medium which

can be use to carry or store desired program code [carrier waves]). As such, the claim is not limited to statutory subject matter and is therefore non-statutory.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

10. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

11. Claims 1-2, 13, 16-17, 19, 21, 23-25, 28-29, 31, 33-38 and 42-46 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Devine et al. (U.S. 6,385,644 B1) hereinafter referred to as Devine.

a. As per claims 1, 24, and 35, Devine teaches: an act of a listener component of the notification service receiving a notification from the notification source in a network format (lines 25-29 of column 13); an act of the listener component translating the notification from the network format into an internal processing format used by the notification service (lines 36-40 of column 13); an act of determining a category of the notification (lines 43-44 of column 13); an act of performing a set of one or more operations on the notification in its internal processing format based on the category of the notification (lines 42-45 of column 13); and an act of a delivery

component of the notification service receiving the notification for delivery to the notification sink (lines 45-46 of column 13).

b. As per claims 2 and 38, Devine teaches: an act of the listener component of the notification service receiving a notification from the notification source in the form of an HTTP post request (lines 44-58 of column 25).

c. As per claim 13, Devine teaches: an act of determining that the notification is a new related notification (lines 10-15 of column 3).

d. As per claims 16 and 28, Devine teaches: an act of accessing a user profile associated with a sender or receiver of the notification (lines 20-29 of column 25).

e. As per claims 17 and 29, Devine teaches: an act of authenticating (lines 47-51 of column 4, lines 42-46 of column 5, and lines 5-54 of column 7).

f. As per claims 19 and 31, Devine teaches: an act of formatting the notification for the destination device (line 56 of column 16 through line 17 of column 17).

g. As per claims 21 and 33, Devine teaches: an act of determining the operations to perform based on the category (lines 21-48 of column 24).

h. As per claims 23 and 34, Devine teaches: an act of determining the order of operations to perform based on the category (lines 17-47 of column 16).

i. As per claim 25, Devine teaches: the one or more computer-readable media are physical storage media (lines 52-55 of column 4).

j. As per claim 36, Devine teaches: an act of determining the category of the notification (lines 43-44 of column 13); and an act of performing a set of one or more

operations on the notification in its internal processing format based on the category of the notification (lines 42-45 of column 13).

k. As per claims 37 and 42, Devine teaches: an act of the notification service receiving source in a network format using a listener component of one or more listener components (lines 25-29 of column 13); a notification from the notification an act of the listener component translating the notification from the network format into an internal processing format used by the notification service (lines 36-40 of column 13); an act of the listener component placing the notification in its internal processing format into a corresponding outgoing queue (lines 33-36 of column 13); an act of a routing component of one or more routing components receiving the notification from the outgoing queue corresponding to the listener component at a corresponding incoming queue (lines 45-46 of column 13); an act of the routing component placing the notification in a corresponding outgoing queue (lines 33-36 of column 13); an act of determining a delivery component to route the notification to of one or more delivery components (lines 36-40 of column 13); and an act of the delivery component receiving the notification, the delivery component configured to deliver the notification to the notification sink (lines 45-46 of column 13).

l. As per claim 43, Devine teaches: the one or more computer-readable media are physical storage media (lines 52-55 of column 4).

m. As per claim 44, Devine teaches: a step for translating the notification so as to be processed by the notification service in a scalable fashion (lines 36-40 of column 13); a step for processing the notification in a scalable fashion (lines 42-45 of

column 13); and an act of the delivery component receiving the notification, the delivery component configured to deliver the notification to the notification sink (lines 45-46 of column 13).

n. As per claim 45, Devine teaches: an act of the notification service receiving a notification from the notification source in a network format using a listener component of one or more listener components (lines 42-45 of column 13); an act of the listener component translating the notification from the network format into an internal processing format used by the notification service (lines 36-40 of column 13); and an act of the listener component placing the notification in its internal processing format into a corresponding outgoing queue (lines 45-46 of column 13).

o. As per claim 46, Devine teaches: an act of a routing component of one or more routing components receiving the notification from the outgoing queue corresponding to the listener component at a corresponding incoming queue (lines 45-46 of column 13); an act of the routing component determining a delivery component to route the notification to of one or more delivery components (lines 36-40 of column 13); and an act of the routing component placing the notification in a corresponding outgoing queue (lines 33-36 of column 13).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

12. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the

invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

13. Claims 3, 4, 5, 22, 39, 40, and 41 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Devine as applied to claims 1, 3, 4, 21, 37, 37, and 37 respectively, further in view of Ellis et al. (U.S. 2002/0026514 A1) hereinafter referred to as Ellis.

a. As per claims 3-5 and 39-41, Devine teaches: an act of the listener component of the notification service receiving a notification from the notification source in the form of an HTTP post request (lines 44-58 of column 25).

Devine fails to teach: an act of the listener component of the notification service receiving a notification from the notification service in the form of an XML document within a SOAP request within the HTTP post request. However, Ellis discloses: "Note that, as would be understood by those of ordinary skill in the art, such protocols may be layered in that, for example, SOAP defines an interapplication messaging protocol for wrapping the message in an XML document that is transferred in accordance with the HTTP," (paragraph [0024] on page 2).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have an act of the listener component of the notification service receive a notification from the notification service in the form of an XML document within a SOAP request within the HTTP post request. "The message may be a request to extract particular information, for example, temperature, status, pressure, or request a service, for example, start/stop a tool operation, from one or more tools 103, e.g., equipment used in semiconductor fabrication facilities," (paragraph [0024] on page 2 of Ellis. It is for this reason that one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's

invention would have been motivated to have an act of the listener component of the notification service receive a notification from the notification service in the form of an XML document within a SOAP request within the HTTP post request in the system as taught by Devine.

b. As per claim 22, Devine fails to teach: an act of referring to an XML document that lists operations to perform for at least the category of the notification. However, Ellis discloses: "Note that, as would be understood by those of ordinary skill in the art, such protocols may be layered in that, for example, SOAP defines an interapplication messaging protocol for wrapping the message in an XML document that is transferred in accordance with the HTTP," (paragraph [0024] on page 2).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to refer to an XML document that lists operations to perform for at least the category of the notification. "The message may be a request to extract particular information, for example, temperature, status, pressure, or request a service, for example, start/stop a tool operation, from one or more tools 103, e.g., equipment used in semiconductor fabrication facilities. For example, a user 101 may issue a message requesting the temperature in a particular chamber where the particular chamber represents a tool 103 in the manufacturing process, e.g., semiconductor process," (paragraph [0024] of page 2 in Ellis). It is for this reason that one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to refer to an XML document that lists operations to perform for at least the category of the notification in the system as taught by Devine.

14. Claims 6, 7, and 14 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Devine as applied to claims 1, 6, and 1 respectively, further in view of Pyhalammi et al. (U.S. 2003/0045273 A1) hereinafter referred to as Pyhalammi.

a. As per claims 6 and 7, Devine fails to teach: an act of the listener component of the notification service receiving a notification from a wireless device and an act of delivering the notification to a mobile service provider. However, Pyhalammi discloses: "The option for wireless terminal device 30 having the capability of being the source of the content to be sent to the network," (paragraph [0023] on page 3).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have the listener component of the notification server receive a notification from a wireless device and delivering the notification to a mobile service provider. "In a preferred embodiment the user receives message content to the terminal device 30 at a reduced price, without having to wait for it to arrive over an active wireless terminal session, making the experience a pleasant one," (paragraph [0023] on page 3 of Pyhalammi). It is for this reason that one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention would have been motivated to have the listener component of the notification server receive a notification from a wireless device and delivering the notification to a mobile service provider in the system as taught by Devine.

b. As per claim 14, Devine fails to teach: an act of determining that the notification is a mobile-originated notification. However, Pyhalammi discloses: "The

option for wireless terminal device 30 having the capability of being the source of the content to be sent to the network," (paragraph [0023] on page 3).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to determine that the notification is a mobile-originated notification. "In a preferred embodiment the user receives message content to the terminal device 30 at a reduced price, without having to wait for it to arrive over an active wireless terminal session, making the experience a pleasant one," (paragraph [0023] on page 3 of Pyhalammi). It is for this reason that one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention would have been motivated to determine that the notification is a mobile-originated notification in the system as taught by Devine.

15. Claims 8, 9, 18, 26, and 30 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Devine as applied to claims 1, 8, 1, 24, and 24 respectively, further in view of Payne et al. (U.S. 6,021,433) hereinafter referred to as Payne.

a. As per claims 8, 9, and 26 Devine fails to teach: an act of the listener component of the notification service receiving a notification from a mobile service provider and an act of delivering the notification to a wireless device. However, Payne discloses: "In accordance with the present invention, the notification centric portions of that information that lives in an electronic medium is wirelessly broadcast on a nationwide basis to wireless receiving devices which are attached to personal computers or other computing devices," (lines 53-58 of column 2).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have the listener component of the notification server receive a notification from a mobile service provider and deliver the notification to a wireless device. "Throughout the day, various pieces of information happening around the world are currently available in a sender initiated paradigm where individuals have to seek out the information," (lines 50-53 of column 2 in Payne); and "Upon receipt of the information at the personal computer, the user is notified through different multimedia alerts that there is an incoming message. Wirelessly broadcasted URL's, associated with the data, are embedded in data packets and provide an automated wired or wireless connection back to the information source for obtaining detailed data," (lines 58-64 of column 2 in Payne). It is for these reasons that one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention would have been motivated to have the listener component of the notification server receive a notification from a mobile service provider and deliver the notification to a wireless device in the system as taught by Devine.

b. As per claims 18 and 30, Devine fails to teach: an act of inserting an advertisement into the notification. However, Payne discloses: "Information, such as advertisements and promotional broadcasts, can be embedded in a multimedia viewer as well as automatically activated on a scheduled or triggered basis," (lines 36-39 of column 3).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to insert an advertisement into the notification. "Wirelessly broadcasted URL's and on-line addresses, associated with the data, are embedded in

multimedia viewers and provide an automated wired connection/link back to the information sources to obtain detailed information," (lines 32-36 of column 3 in Payne). It is for this reason that one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention would have been motivated to insert an advertisement into the notification in the system as taught by Devine.

16. Claims 10-12 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Devine as applied to claim 1, in view of Whitten, II (U.S. 2002/0083136 A1) hereinafter referred to as Whitten.

a. As per claims 10 and 12, Devine fails to teach: an act of determining that the notification is an instant message; and an act of determining that the notification is a buddy list related notification. However, Whitten discloses: "This selection arrangement allows a potential recipient to specify availability to receive instant messages from a plurality of lists by a simple selection by use of a simple pointer (e.g., mouse) to select or activate desired list of senders," (paragraph [0008] on page 1); and "In another exemplary version, a recipient controls a "buddy list" and is permitted to place instant messaging buddies into categories and then to differentially indicate availability status to each category," (paragraph [0007] of page 1).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to determine that the notification is an instant message; and determine that the notification is a buddy list related notification. "Desired senders are easily selected and undesired interruptions to the recipient are determined by non-

action of specifying a list for message receipt. The potential recipients may adjust membership lists in each category and select a status for each category," (paragraph [0008] on page 1 of Whitten). It is for this reason that one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention would have been motivated to determine that the notification is an instant message; and determine that the notification is a buddy list related notification in the system as taught by Devine.

b. As per claim 11, Devine fails to teach: an act of failing to detect an express category of the notification; and an act of determining that the notification is of a default category based on the failure to detect an express category. However, Whitten discloses: "As shown, various status possibilities are associated with each column heading defining category lists. In the exemplary embodiment several status states include A=available, B=busy-but-on-line, U=unavailable, E=emergency. As is apparent these status possibilities refer to the column of names below. An individual blocked according to one category may be enabled by being listed in another category (which recipient has enabled) and hence able to send an instant message to the recipient," (paragraph [0013] on page 2).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to fail to detect an express category of the notification; and determining that the notification is of a default category based on the failure to detect an express category. "The recipient breaks the list into several categories expressing the possible interests of senders as indicated by the block 203. Acceptable senders are listed in each category. Individual senders may be listed in more than one category, as

indicated in block 207. Included with each category is a list of status indicators as shown in the block 205. These place restrictions in receiving instant messages from otherwise acceptable senders," (paragraph [0014] on page 2 of Whitten). It is for this reason that one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention would have been motivated to fail to detect an express category of the notification; and determining that the notification is of a default category based on the failure to detect an express category in the system as taught by Devine.

17. Claims 15 and 27 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Devine as applied to claims 1 and 24, further in view of Kitamura (U.S. 5,987,106).

As per claims 15 and 27, Devine fails to teach: an act of determining whether to check that the notification should be muted. However, Kitamura discloses: "It would be advantageous if such a system could selectively generate an audio volume control signal for any of a determined number of audio generating devices upon detection of an audio mute notification signal," (lines 56-59 of column 1).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to determine whether to check that the notification should be muted. "When multiple audio generating devices are operational, such as when a movie is being watched on a DVD player in one room and a television is being watched in another room, and the telephone rings, the volume from the movie (speakers) or television can often be excessively loud so that the ring is not heard. Also, if the ring is heard, a person wishing to converse on the telephone has to manually reduce the

volume or leave the room with the telephone to avoid being inundated by the loud audio. The problem is compounded when multiple telephones are located in a home or office building and multiple audio generating devices can be operational at the same time. Consequently, there exists a need for an automatic volume control/pause control system and method for use in multimedia computer systems that substantially overcomes one or more of these problems," (lines 41-56 of column 1 in Kitamura). It is for this reason that one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention would have been motivated to determine whether to check that the notifications should be muted in the system as taught by Devine.

18. Claims 20 and 32 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Devine as applied to claims 1 and 24 respectively, further in view of TDB-ACC-NO: NN86023759 hereinafter referred to as NN86023759.

As per claims 20 and 32, Devine fails to teach: an act of determining whether the user has exceeded a message limit. However, NN86023759 discloses: "For device messages the limit is 10, for operator messages the limit is 20, and for SYSTEM and Communications messages the limit is 100," (paragraph 1 on page 2).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to determine whether the user has exceeded a message limit. "The area for 'New' messages can grow to the limit of disk space. However, the area for 'Old' messages is fixed to a predefined number of messages and contains those most recently viewed," (paragraph 1 on page 2 of NN86023759). It is for this reason that one

of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention would have been motivated to determine whether the user has exceeded a message limit in the system as taught by Devine.

Conclusion

19. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Esposito et al. (U.S. 6,341,270 B1) discloses method for providing vendor notification marketing in an electronic commerce network environment.

Bailey, III (U.S. 6,353,661 B1) discloses network and communication access systems.

Fox et al. (U.S. 6,421,781 B1) discloses method for maintaining security in a push server.

Horvitz et al. (U.S. 6,513,026 B1) discloses decision theoretic principles and policies for notification.

Swank (U.S. 6,697,924 B2) discloses storage area network methods and apparatus for identifying fiber channel devices in kernel mode.

Scarpelli (U.S. 2002/0019758 A1) discloses load management dispatch system.

Collins (U.S. 2002/0178243 A1) discloses method for centrally managing network devices.

Duvvuru (U.S. 2003/0018766 A1) discloses differentiated quality of service context assignment and propagation.

20. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Michael Meucci at (571) 272-3892. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 9:00 AM to 6:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Rupal Dharia, can be reached at (571) 272-3880. The fax phone number for this Group is (703) 872-9306.

Communications via Internet e-mail regarding this application, other than those under 35 U.S.C. 132 or which otherwise require a signature, may be used by the applicant and should be addressed to [michael.meucci@uspto.gov].

All Internet e-mail communications will be made of record in the application file. PTO employees do not engage in Internet communications where there exists a possibility that sensitive information could be identified or exchanged unless the record includes a properly signed express waiver of the confidentiality requirements of 35 U.S.C. 122. This is more clearly set forth in the Interim Internet Usage Policy published in the Official Gazette of the Patent and Trademark on February 25, 1997 at 1195 OG 89.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you

Application/Control Number: 10/086,792

Page 19

Art Unit: 2142

have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Kamini Shah
KAMINI SHAH
PRIMARY EXAMINER
AU 2142